



MARKSCHEME

May 2014

PHILOSOPHY

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 2

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB Assessment Centre.*

Note to examiners

This markscheme outlines what members of the paper setting team had in mind when they devised the questions. The topics listed in the bullet points indicate possible areas candidates might cover in their answers. They are not compulsory points and not necessarily the best possible points. They are only a framework to help examiners in their assessment. Examiners should be responsive to any other valid points or any other valid approaches.

Paper 2 guidance

Examiners are reminded that in the examination paper it states that candidates are expected to demonstrate the following skills. Since these skills are encouraged within the assessment criteria, examiners should take them into account in their marking:

- *argue in an organized way using clear, precise language, which is appropriate to philosophy, and demonstrate an understanding of the author's specific terminology*
- *show an understanding of the specific demands of the question*
- *give references to the ideas and arguments presented in the text*
- *present appropriate examples providing support for their overall argument*
- *identify and analyse counter-arguments*
- *provide relevant supporting material, illustrations and/or examples*
- *develop a critical evaluation of the ideas and arguments of the text*
- *offer a clear and philosophically relevant personal response to the position expressed by the author.*

Using the assessment criteria

Candidates at both Higher Level and Standard Level answer **one** question on the prescribed texts.

Answers are assessed according to the assessment criteria set out on pages 4–7.

Paper 2 assessment criteria

A Expression

- Has the candidate presented ideas in an organized way?
- How clear and precise is the language used by the candidate?
- To what extent is the language appropriate to philosophy?
- To what extent has the candidate understood the author’s use of specific terminology?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate expresses some basic ideas but it is not clear what the answer is trying to convey. The use of language is not appropriate to philosophy.
2	The candidate presents some ideas in an organized way. There is some clarity of expression but the answer cannot always be followed. The use of language is not always appropriate to philosophy. The candidate shows some understanding of the author’s use of specific terminology but only in a limited way.
3	The candidate presents ideas in an organized way and the answer can be easily followed. The use of language is appropriate to philosophy and the author’s use of specific terminology is satisfactorily understood.
4	The candidate presents ideas in an organized and coherent way and insights are clearly articulated. The use of language is effective and appropriate to philosophy. The candidate shows a clear understanding and use of the author’s specific terminology.
5	The candidate presents ideas in an organized, coherent and incisive way, insights are clearly articulated and the answer is focused and sustained. The use of language is precise and appropriate to philosophy. The candidate shows an assured understanding and use of the author’s specific terminology.

B Knowledge and understanding of the text

- How well does the candidate know the text?
- To what extent has the candidate understood the author’s ideas, arguments and key concepts?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate demonstrates a superficial knowledge of the text and there is only a basic understanding of the author’s ideas, arguments and key concepts.
2	The candidate demonstrates some knowledge of the text, with a limited understanding of the author’s ideas, arguments and key concepts.
3	The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of the text and the author’s ideas, arguments and key concepts are satisfactorily understood. There is some insight into the author’s arguments.
4	The candidate demonstrates a good knowledge of the text and the author’s ideas, arguments and key concepts are clearly understood. The candidate is able to show an understanding of some of the more difficult or subtle points of the author’s arguments.
5	The candidate demonstrates that the text has been thoroughly and carefully read. The candidate shows an in-depth understanding of the author’s arguments, with a close attention to detail.

C Identification and analysis of relevant material

- How well has the candidate understood the specific demands of the question?
- To what extent does the candidate identify and analyse relevant supporting material?
- How effectively does the candidate analyse the supporting material, examples and counter-arguments?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1–2	The candidate shows little understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies relevant supporting material in only a limited way. There is little analysis and few or no examples are given.
3–4	The candidate shows some understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies and analyses some relevant supporting material. Some appropriate examples are used.
5–6	The candidate shows a satisfactory understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies supporting material that is nearly always relevant. There is a satisfactory analysis of this material. Examples are appropriate and give some support to the argument.
7–8	The candidate shows an effective understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies relevant supporting material that is analysed in a sound and thoughtful way. Examples are appropriate in their support of the overall argument. Some counter-arguments are identified.
9–10	The candidate shows an in-depth understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies supporting material that is always relevant. The implications of this material are analysed in detail. Examples are well chosen and compelling in their support of the overall argument. Counter-arguments are identified and analysed in a convincing way.

D Development and evaluation

- Does the candidate develop the argument in a coherent way?
- How well does the candidate develop and evaluate the ideas and arguments of the text?
- To what extent does the candidate express a relevant personal response?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1–2	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in a basic way and there is little or no evaluation of the text.
3–4	The candidate develops some ideas and arguments but the development is simple, or is asserted without reference to the text. There may be some basic evaluation of the ideas and arguments of the text but it is not developed.
5–6	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in a satisfactory way and evaluates them to some extent. A limited critique of the ideas and arguments of the text is offered. There is some evidence of a relevant personal response.
7–8	The candidate develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held perspective, in close response to the ideas and arguments of the text. Evaluation is thoughtful and convincing and the candidate offers a critique of the text that goes beyond a statement of opinion or belief. There is good evidence of a relevant personal response.
9–10	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in an incisive and coherent way in detailed response to the text. Evaluation is compelling or subtle, and convincing, and the candidate offers a critique of the text that shows strong evidence of a relevant personal response. The candidate shows an ability to challenge the assumptions made by the author and explores different approaches to the text.

Bhagavad Gita

1. Explain and discuss the concept of spiritual enlightenment as the ultimate good.

The aim of this question is to analyse the concept of *moksa*, or spiritual enlightenment, or unity with God. Freedom from attachment is the necessary condition for *moksa*. There are three elements that need mastery and adoption for this freedom: *karma* (action), *jnana* (knowledge), and *bhakti* (devotion, or love). *Karma* is the motives and desires that initiate action; *jnana* is understanding that these desires are false, and the wise person perceives all others in them, and themselves in all others; *bhakti* is acting with desirelessness, and these actions are like offerings to Krishna. Freedom from attachment is not primarily about objects, but about the outcomes of action. If a person acts with a clear and certain conscience, then performing duties will be acts performed in real freedom. There is no conflict, regret, or equivocation in performing duties. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Can the wise person transcend moral conflicts? What does this mean? Do they have a licence to perform any act as long as it is done with a clear conscience? Are the persons who attain *moksa* like Nietzsche's *Übermensch*? Do they stand apart from family, caste and traditions? If so, then what claims do duties have on them?
- What Krishna means when he says that all emotions and desires are reducible to one. How does this lead us to believe that all people are united?
- How I can pursue *moksa* as an ultimate good if I am supposed to live without desire for any goal.

2. Explain and discuss the nature of duty or *dharma*.

A central concern of the *Gita* is how our duties are to be fulfilled without conflict. The aim of this question is to invite an analysis of the concept of duty or *dharma*. In Arjuna's case, there are the conflicting *dharmas* of family, caste and those that apply to all in all contexts, such as "never spill the blood of another". There are also the *dharmas* of tradition. The concept of *dharma* found in the *Gita* is not one that strictly mirrors or is limited to duty. *Dharma* also seems to apply to virtues like serenity, self-control, wisdom and faith; these are qualities, not duties, though one could argue that one has a duty to attain these for a morally virtuous life. Some *dharmas* are obligatory, while others are contingent; some are universal like friendship, compassion, forgiveness and penance. The result is a concept that is far wider than Western conceptions of duty. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether *dharmas* are behavioural expectations, dictated by religious, traditional and social requirements
- Whether there are rational justifications in the scriptures for the many *dharmas*, or whether it is merely tradition and social authorities that determine the classification
- Whether, despite the conflicts in *dharmas*, the solution to conflict is in the pursuit of another state of being, *ie moksa*
- Whether there is a necessary connection between leading a virtuous life and a spiritual life
- Whether actions are possible without desires
- Whether there is any value in analysing *dharma*, as it seems to cover most areas of moral conduct.

Confucius: *The Analects*

3. Evaluate the relationship between the individual practising *li* (ritual) and achieving harmony.

This question invites an evaluation of the Confucian claim that in the practice of rites and rules of propriety, harmony is the most valuable thing. This allows for a discussion of Confucian ideals and how they impact on ethical teaching for individuals and society. Responses should analyse and evaluate the role of *li* as a route to achieving harmony. In practising *li* the individual practises propriety and shows courtesy and proper reverence, which forms an ideal standard of conduct, and this establishes an individual’s character – is this account reasonable? For Confucius, propriety ensures appropriate attitudes like respectfulness, boldness, carefulness *etc.*, but would a sense of outrage or extreme passion do more to change the world for the better? *Li* should be combined with *jen* (humaneness) which shows a concern for others, enabling the individual to achieve the status of *Chun Tzu*—gentleman—which ensures harmony for the individual and for society. Is this Confucian claim about achieving harmony plausible? Is it based on critical observation or speculative metaphysics about the human condition? *Li* is applied especially to activities in the home and attitudes relating to family, which forms the basic building block of society. Is it credible to draw conclusions about societal harmony on the basis of family experience? How can conflicts of interest be resolved? Much is descriptive in *The Analects*. There is a lack of a metaphysical basis for arguing for societal harmony. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether the harmonious character is defined by *li* practices or caused by *li* practices
- The role of family in achieving individual and societal harmony
- The applicability of the family unit to society at large
- The notion of rulership in relation to cultivating societal harmony through virtuous leadership
- Whether “outer” activities like archery or writing can produce “inner” harmony
- The use of the past to guide the teachings for the present and future.

4. Explain and discuss how familial relationships provide guidance for good government.

This question invites an exploration of the vision Confucius had for good government. In Book 2 he continues with the earlier theme of filial piety while turning toward what constitutes good leadership in the state. The family setting provides a context for teaching about leadership, with the ruler like a father in a family setting. The moral example set by a father in a family is what a ruler should emulate, and this might be challenged in a response. Practising *li* is the basis of a well-ordered society and this cultivation requires a respect for family, tradition and seeing the needs of others alongside one's own, in a family, and by extension, in a broader setting. Why should family have the place accorded it in Confucian teaching? What makes the family the unit that gives such a rich seam for guidance in other areas of public life? Chapters on government follow, and are mixed with, passages about filial piety giving a context of the kinds of relationships envisaged in good government. Is this account of government plausible in the modern world? The cultivation of *te* (virtue) is vital and this can be achieved through practice of *li* and through proper relationships within the family, with the proper leader being like a star on whose bearings others fix themselves for guidance. For Confucius, reverence for tradition and respect for ancestors and history is an inspiration and motivation for good government (filial piety also encourages this). Is the authoritarian idea of a paternal leading figure a good model for government? What can be made of this by those who are in families without fathers or in dysfunctional families? In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The lack of authoritarianism inherent in *wu wei*; how does *wu wei* fit the family model of good governance?
- The role played by respect for tradition in Confucius's model of government
- Whether government for all should be predicated on the relationships generated in a family
- The absence of force and leadership – is this reasonable in both family and societal settings?
- The *Chun Tzu* as a model that exemplifies different roles including son, husband and father
- The dominant male expectation of leadership – is this a problem for readers in the 21st century?

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

5. Evaluate the claim that understanding the *Tao Te Ching* might be inspirational and constructive for modern society.

The claim covers a wide gamut of possible dimensions, *eg* metaphysical, ethical, social and political. The question asks for an evaluation of some of them; *eg* it opens an opportunity to develop explanations with regard to the social and political views expressed in the text. The *Tao* points out an ideal of naturalness specific to human beings and society: self-transformation, self-prosperity, self-simplicity, self-equilibrium, self-obedience, and self-stabilization. This ideal presents a way in which to approach the problem of achieving harmony in the universe, in communities, and between and within individuals without recourse to external schemes, coercion and oppression. When the *Tao* is disregarded in the world, the “war-horses breed in the border lands”. What makes a great state is its being like a low-lying, down-flowing stream; it becomes the centre to which tend all the small states under heaven. This might be illustrated by the case of all females: the female always overcomes the male by her stillness. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Interpretations of the diverse teachings projected onto and applied to social and political contemporary issues
- How the *Tao Te Ching* expresses opposition to several contemporary “progressive” movements, such as the encouragement of personal ambition or rational-utilitarian thought among the peasantry, as a means of increasing material production and political strength. This causes discontent and contention and upsets social harmony, making it difficult for rulers to maintain a healthy (that is, simple traditional agrarian) social order. Are traditional agrarian values apt to be inspirational and constructive for modern society?
- Whether moderation, a central precept in general and in political life, is realistic given the passions and interests involved in the political life
- Whether the *Tao* might be inspirational and constructive, but, on the other hand, might also distract and move away from the real present world.

6. **“*Tao* is not an entity, substance, God, abstract notion, or anything conceptualized. *Tao* is a metaphysical symbol which directly denotes nature itself in terms of the spontaneity of the world and man.” Discuss and evaluate.**

The question asks for a discussion and evaluation of the central notion of the *Tao*. It opens the analysis in both directions between the world and humankind. *Tao* means “a road”, and is often translated as “the Way”. The *Tao* is the process of reality itself, the way things come together, while still transforming; this reflects the deep belief that change is the most basic character of things. The *Tao* is often described in terms that indicate: reality, origin, principle, function, virtue and technique. “The *Tao* produced the One, the One produced the two, the two produced the three, and the three produced the ten thousand things” (Chapter 42). Although the myriad things exist in myriad forms, they all revert to the One. The metaphysics of *Tao* are non-dualistic and non-conceptual. The *Tao* is the ultimate source and foundation of Heaven, earth, and people. It is not only the source, but also the ground, sustenance, and sustaining power of all beings. This function is embodied in “virtue” or “power” (*de*). *De* designates the *Tao*’s function, feature, and principle in individual beings. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether the ideal of the sage might be seen as the correspondence of humankind with the *Tao*
- Interpretations of the *Tao* in terms of modern Western philosophical concepts: mysterious “ineffable reality”, “the source of all things”, a “metaphysical monistic absolute”. Are any of these a good match?
- The metaphysics of the *Tao* requires an understanding based on a non-conceptual approach: self-cultivation, a primordial level of human consciousness that is inactive, unaroused, and undifferentiated. If this characterization is correct, how can humans become philosophically aware of the *Tao*?
- Whether the *Tao* can be compared with a principle of nature. In this case, how far can the comparison between water and human life be sustained?
- The opposition between the idea that there is no need for human tampering with the flow of reality and the idea of an active transformation of it
- Whether it would mean that it is a kind of subjective representation, if the *Tao* is a metaphysical symbol
- To what extent the claim is consistent with the initial idea of the text that the *Tao* has no name.

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV–IX**7. Explain and discuss the claim that the individual’s virtue, rather than knowledge, is the most important element for the basis of an ideal state.**

The aim of this question is to invite an analysis of the role of moral qualities in Plato’s conception of the ideal state. Plato assumes that a group of virtuous individuals makes for a just society. Learning virtue is the goal of the initial stage of mass education, rather than academic knowledge. Later, the Good is identified as the ultimate aim of the philosopher king, as the Good illuminates all knowledge. The moral and the political are again found in the corruption of the perfect state, along with the corruption of the individual’s character. Plato recognizes that the survival of any state resides in its legitimacy to rule. This legitimacy would be met if all citizens valued the same things as the rulers, so knowledge could be left for those who need it and are capable of learning. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether the virtues education of the young is little more than indoctrination leading to a moral conformity. This seems a poor preparation for the intellectual flexibility and subtlety required for the philosopher king
- Whether the Good makes knowledge (Forms) intelligible. Does this mean that Plato holds that Forms are somehow incomplete? Or in referring to “the Good” as the end of all endeavours does he mean the wisdom to apply the theoretical knowledge found from the Forms?
- Whether just individuals make for a just society, and whether individual virtue is contingent upon political or social conditions
- Whether a ruler requires other qualities apart from virtue and knowledge.

8. Explain and discuss the claim that justice is primarily a matter of internal harmony.

In this question the aim is for candidates to analyse and evaluate Plato's concept of justice, with a focus on the origin of justice in the state and its relationship to the harmony of the individual's soul. One of the differences between modern and Platonic notions of justice is the focus and source of justice; in modern views, the emphasis is on social fairness and equality, or on distributive methods to achieve these goals. These conceptions emphasize, or make certain assumptions about external relations with others, and the claims they have upon us. With Plato, the individual's virtue is analogous to justice in the state. The key element for the individual is the harmony between the three parts of the soul: desire, spirit, and reason, with reason as the guiding and mediating element. Philosopher kings have these elements in perfect harmony. With a compulsory education focused on studying virtue and playing games, Plato's citizens find fulfilment doing what they are best suited to; this leads Plato to say that justice is minding one's own business, a non-interference in the smooth governing of the state, a balance and harmony between the different classes. Those whose function is governing can do so without impediment, and the others perform their duties and functions that result in a just and harmonious state. Individual harmony is thus analogous to the balance and harmony between the different classes in the state. Justice is, then, primarily about cooperation between the classes of citizens, not about the harmony of the parts of the individual. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The clarity of Plato's explanation of desires and spirit. On occasions, it seems that what counts as spirit, could apply to desire
- Whether individual virtue is a necessary condition for justice
- Whether the absence of a discussion of individual happiness, rights, or autonomy as conditions for justice, is a serious omission
- Whether Plato's citizen is a passive, compliant individual with no interest in the polity of the society. If so, how would this be in the interests of justice?
- The Simile of the Ship.

René Descartes: *Meditations*

9. Evaluate the claim that in relying on God to underwrite the reliability of human cognition Descartes is guilty of circular reasoning.

This question asks whether Descartes’s argument for the reliability of human cognition is circular, in that one of the premises depends on the conclusion. Human cognition is subject to error because humans assent to propositions whose truth is uncertain. But, according to the Fourth Meditation, if humans use their God-given capacity for reasoning properly, and assent only to what they clearly and distinctly perceive, they can be sure of avoiding error. Critics from Descartes’s own day onwards have asked how, if it is necessary beforehand to establish the existence of God in order to underwrite the reliability of human cognition, can we be sure of the reliability of the reasoning required to establish the existence of God? Descartes seems to have thought that because certain basic truths (eg the *cogito*) were self-evident that they were not subject to skeptical doubt and so were knowable independent of proving the existence of God. He regarded it as conceptually contradictory to think that God did not exist. Hence, he considered that dependence on God was ontological not epistemic and, therefore, his reasoning was not circular. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How Descartes’s belief that the route from subjective certainty to reliable knowledge depended on God as the source of all truth
- Descartes’s contention that if humans use their God-given power for reason to assent only to what they clearly and distinctly perceive, they can avoid error
- Descartes’s belief that his reasoning was not circular because “if a conviction is so firm that it is impossible for us ever to have any reason for doubting what we are convinced of, then there are no further questions for us to ask” (Second Set of Replies to Objections to the *Meditations*)
- The issue raised by Descartes himself in the First Meditation, namely, that it is conceivable that apparently self-evident truths might be subject to systematic distortion.

10. Evaluate Descartes’s claim that “the method of doubt” helps us distinguish those ideas that are unshakeable from those that at first glance appear to be unshakeable.

The question asks for an evaluation of the methodology Descartes employs to distinguish unshakeable ideas from merely apparently unshakeable ideas. According to Descartes, the method of doubt (*ie* making doubt global and exaggerated) is the best means of defeating skepticism because global doubt avoids the possibility of accepting a falsehood that will have knock-on effects to other beliefs, and exaggerated doubt is the most likely way to eliminate the largest possible number of ideas that may appear unshakeable but are not. To illustrate: ordinary empirical beliefs are open to doubt because of the possibility of dreaming and even logical principles might have been inculcated in us by an evil demon. To locate indubitable beliefs these possibilities must be eliminated. Only then can we have certainty that our beliefs have not been infected by unnoticed error. Challenges have been made to both of Descartes’s claims. First, many have contended that merely being able to conceive of a possible situation that is incompatible with the truth of an everyday claim does not show the everyday claim to be unwarranted. In other words, there are different notions of certainty and Descartes’s critics contend that he relies on an idea of certainty that is unreasonable because it hinges on an inappropriate notion of proof. Second, his understanding of doubt has been challenged for being so abstract as to be out of touch with everyday notions of what constitute reliable beliefs. In consequence, it does not produce genuine doubt. Indeed, even Descartes admitted that it was only “so to speak, metaphysical [doubt]”. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How Descartes’s method of doubt is to be characterized
- How the method of doubt is supposed to give us a reliable foundation for our beliefs
- Whether the idea of certainty that Descartes presupposes is the only defensible one
- Whether Descartes’s idea of doubt is defensible.

John Locke: *Second Treatise on Government*

- 11. Evaluate the claim that “No man’s labour could subdue or appropriate all, nor could his enjoyment consume more than one small part; so that it was impossible for any man to entrench upon the right of another or acquire to himself a property to the prejudice of his neighbour”.**

This question invites an evaluation of Locke’s concept of property, the role of property within civil society, and whether Locke argued for a more equitable distribution of property. The definition of the origin of private property and the relationship of property to labour needs to be explored as the earth was given in common to all men. The issue of a more equal distribution of property could be discussed as Locke’s man should not own too much. The interaction of this idea with the Golden Rule and the application of natural rights might also be investigated. Money and property could be explored, raising the issue of a change in how ownership is defined. The extent to which ownership of property arises out of a state of nature might challenge Locke’s concept of the state of nature and the possibility of allowing the “flourishing of others”. The issue of whether the protection of property, being one of the functions of civil government, encourages an unfair distribution of property could also be developed. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether a human gains enjoyment by having more property than another
- The use of another’s labour to justify one’s ownership of property
- How far reason and survival support a more equal distribution of property
- The complexity of ownership and the concept of property with the increasing use of money/gold
- How justified it is to claim that property ownership is one of the fundamental rights of humans.

12. Evaluate the claim that parents have power over their children because of their “duty, which is incumbent on them, to take care of their offspring during the imperfect state of childhood”.

This question allows for an evaluation of the status of children within the family and the state, and the role of parental power paralleled with that of the state. It should be appreciated that in Locke’s era the father dominated, but a broader interpretation could entertain parental power and influence, and not just paternal power. The limited status and rights of children based on the fact that they have limited powers of reason might be challenged now in the modern era. The relationship of inheritance and obedience linked to oaths of allegiance and similar allegiance to government could be mentioned. The duty of care balanced by discipline based on the assumption that parents are basically good might be challenged and reference to child abuse might be made. The parallels between generational parental obedience and obedience to the state might be developed. As children grow up they acquire more reason. Greater reason leads to greater freedom which might be linked to their relationship to the state. This might be questioned in that a mature population with high levels of reason resulting from education might not necessarily have more freedom within a state. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The rights of children even though they are in an “imperfect state” and the role of the state in protecting children from their parents
- Whether children acquire rationality and autonomy in a rigid, disciplined system
- The possible links to the obligations and duties of a monarch if the monarch is seen as the “father of the people”
- Locke’s ideas of play and the role of a tutor, contrasted with that of the parent
- The degree to which parallels can be drawn between rules and authority within a family and rules and authority within the state
- The issue of women’s often unrecognized exclusion from power because of their reproductive and family care roles (which is heightened in Locke’s account because of the male-dominated character of his own society).

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

13. Explain and discuss the idea that we may only use coercion to defend either ourselves or others from harm.

The question asks for an explanation and discussion of the “one very simple principle”, known as the “Harm Principle”, laid down by Mill to govern the use of coercion in society – it is that we may only coerce others either to defend ourselves, or to defend others from harm. “The only end for which mankind is justified in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number is protection from harm.” The principle concerns civil and social liberty or, to look at it from the contrary point of view, the nature and limits of the power that can legitimately be exercised by society over the individual. By coercion Mill means both the use of legal penalties and the operation of public opinion. The only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. The principle authorizes the subjection of individual spontaneity to external control, only in respect to those actions which concern the interests of other people. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How some critics thought that Mill was frightened by the prospect of a mass democracy in which working-class opinion would be oppressive and perhaps violent. Mill was frightened by middle-class conformism much more than by anything to be looked for from an enfranchised working-class
- The notion of utility and how it might fit with the idea of liberty
- How Mill’s simple principle rules out paternalistic interventions to save people from themselves, and ideal interventions to make people behave better
- The implications of the principle: it requires liberty of tastes and pursuits; of framing the plan of our life to suit our own character; of doing as we like, subject to such consequences as may follow, without impediment so long as we do not harm others, even though they should think our conduct foolish, perverse, or wrong
- What counts as “harm to others”? What marks the boundary between conduct that is principally self-regarding *versus* conduct that involves others? Does drug-use cause harm to others sufficient to be prevented? Does pornography?
- Given that no civilized society allows conduct in public that is seriously offensive, and many such societies allow paternalistic interventions, is Mill’s view too extreme to be defensible?

14. **“This distinction between sanction and persuasion, between coercion and free choice, ultimately between rules of law and rules of opinion, is at the very centre of Mill’s understanding of liberty.” Discuss and evaluate.**

The question asks for an evaluation of the defensibility of Mill’s central concern: to show that liberty was consistent not only with the “imposition of social obligations by law”, but also with the “imposition” of persuasion by opinion and example. Rules of opinion, which operate by advice, instruction and persuasion, require an active and disinterested concern for the character and conduct of other people. Rules related to persuasion are the consequence of active and critical free inquiry and their end or function is to encourage self-culture and to promote self-regarding virtues. Rules of law: the authoritative interference of government, operated by sanction and prohibition. They are to be imposed when conduct either threatens or actually affects the legitimate rights and interests of a person or persons other than the agent. Rules of law are concerned only with the other-regarding consequences of action; rules of opinion or persuasion are concerned only with the quality of self-regarding behaviour where no question of harm to others or of duty arises. To Mill, being free implies a capacity to be educated and to be convinced by good argument. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The parallel between the distinction concerning the two kinds of rules and Mill’s moral philosophy. Persuasion and sanction differ as virtue and duty differ: the difference is between acts which are meritorious and subject to the diversity of opinion, and acts which are obligatory and subject to law
- Whether Mill’s distinction between rules of law and rules of opinion is a factual or a normative one, or both; whether “rules of opinion” can operate just as coercively in certain contexts as rules of law (*via* social sanctions and prohibitions)
- The extent to which people should be left free “for the general interest”
- The limits of persuasion, granted that persuasion is different from compulsion
- Whether Mill’s argument is a kind of defence of a person’s right to live as he or she likes
- What is properly meant by “rules of opinion”? The opinions of the public at large or “informal rules” (in contrast with formal legal rules)? Consider the rules of certain clubs – these are not legal rules but they may well be in place to protect members from harm, in particular, harm that would not be appropriate to take to the courts.

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

15. Explain and discuss the view that Nietzsche’s account of the origins of morality gives increased responsibility to individuals for their moral lives.

This question invites a consideration of the implications of Nietzsche’s account of morality having a certain genealogy, specifically with regard to individuals’ responsibility. Nietzsche’s account of the way moral language developed denies the possibility of finding a single authoritative origin (like coming from a god). Morality is more born of a process than a single event. With morality arising in a multiplicity of settings, the individual has more freedom to see him/herself in a broader context and thus decide what is moral. Ultimately, there is nothing sacred about morality, it is something we can criticize and hold up to inspection for ourselves, and it is something the individual can take responsibility for. The genealogical explanation claims that meanings of morality vary over time, allowing the individual to define meaning for him/herself. Is Nietzsche’s use of genealogy an effective account of moral language, and on what assumptions does it rest? Is it plausible as an explanation or better understood as an expression of Nietzsche’s own psychology? The winding route of moral understanding shows there to be no fundamental or objective reality to the concepts involved. Beyond concepts lies an unseen will to power which dominates individuals’ moral lives. For Nietzsche the will dominating a thing gives it its meaning and Nietzsche’s account amounts to a significant stage in the history of moral skepticism and the “error theory” of morality. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether perspectivism enables an understanding of the meaning of morality
- Whether morality is completely arbitrary except for the will bending it to its power
- Nietzsche’s analysis that morality is currently dominated by antipathy towards the strong and a sense of resentment
- That there is no sense in which the “good” is what is good for us objectively, rather we apply our will and bend morality to our own purposes
- That the present ascetic morality turns attention inwards, making the battle ground for the will to power to be ourselves
- Slave and master morality
- Whether Nietzsche’s account gives rise to a positive moral outlook (in terms of self-affirmation), not just a negative one (in terms of resentment).

16. Explain and discuss Nietzsche’s account of asceticism.

This question invites an exploration of Nietzsche’s third essay, “What do ascetic ideals mean?”, in which Nietzsche lays down his analysis of the forces that dominate life. The ascetic ideal has implications for a variety of groups, including artists, priests, philosophers *et al.* Nietzsche’s overall statement is that humans would rather will nothingness than not will at all, showing his thesis that humans seek to have goals to make sense of life. Candidates might use as an example Wagner’s use of ideology based on Schopenhauer as an illustration of how the artist will not show us the real meaning of the ascetic ideal as s/he needs to lean on the authority of others. For philosophers the meaning of ascetic ideals involves a determination to gain power and to affirm existence. Philosophers do not think disinterestedly about ascetic ideals, instead they look at how they can benefit from them. In the past philosophers needed to hide themselves as philosophers from others, as they would have been rejected by a world which needed to fear people to listen to them; philosophers thus adopted the countenance of the ascetic priest. The priest preys on the weak to maintain power using guilt in that process encouraging individuals to turn in on themselves and induce guilt. Modern antidotes to the effect of ascetic ideals include scientists, historians and his so-called “comedians of the ideal” or contemplatives. Is Nietzsche justified in thinking that morality – as construed by society in his time – undermines human flourishing, which Nietzsche depicts in egoistic terms? Other approaches to morality deny Nietzsche’s egoistic approach to human flourishing and offer different accounts (*eg* utilitarianism). In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The ascetic ideal and truth
- Guilt and bad conscience
- Nietzsche’s historical analysis – is it convincing and justified?
- Nietzsche’s analyses of philosophy and science – are they convincing and justified?
- Whether Nietzsche’s account of truth in the contemporary setting is convincing
- Disinterest and examples such as Kant and Schopenhauer.

Bertrand Russell: *The Problems of Philosophy***17. Evaluate the arguments in support of the sense-data theory of perception.**

This question invites an evaluation of Russell's case for calling what we perceive sense-data, which is supported by various arguments in the opening chapter. Russell rejects Descartes's global skepticism about empirical knowledge, but examines the problems associated with knowledge gained through the senses. Russell places belief based on perception at the heart of knowledge even if further evidence could appear later to confirm the belief as knowledge. Sense-data is what the knower is immediately aware of, standing in an empirical tradition of gaining knowledge through perception. How is Russell's account of *sensibilia* supposed to provide knowledge that is superior to the ordinary conception of knowledge of substances, when *sensibilia* are not known through direct acquaintance? How successful is the argument from perspectival variation? Responses might also include reference to Russell's secondary qualities argument and his time gap argument. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The incorrigibility of sense-data
- The issue of reifying objects
- The idea that secondary qualities are subjective
- Whether we see things as they were, as a counter to the time gap argument
- The strengths, weaknesses and implications of Russell's theory.

18. Explain and discuss Russell’s account of induction.

This question invites an exploration of Russell’s critique of induction in Chapter 6. Standing in Hume’s tradition, Russell explores the logical implications of knowledge gained through inductive argumentation. Induction enables the knower to go beyond the evidence gained *via* particular sense experience to (claimed) knowledge of things yet to be experienced. Thus, induction enables the sphere of an individual’s knowledge to be greatly enlarged. Russell argues there is a general principle that enables us to have knowledge beyond the merely personal: “the existence of one sort of thing, A, is the sign of the existence of some other thing, B ...”. An important example of Russell’s is his consideration of our knowledge that the sun will rise tomorrow. Russell considers the rational justification for trusting induction as a reliable source of knowledge and treats the issue of the uniformity of nature. Candidates might consider alternative responses to the problem of induction, *eg* pragmatism. Does Russell provide a balanced approach to the problem he highlights? In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Possible logical problems with induction
- Psychological habits of mind formed by repeated instances of events
- Hume’s criticism that “... the fact that two things have often been found together and never apart does not, by itself, suffice to prove demonstratively that they will be found together in the next case ...”
- Whether experience can be appealed to in order to prove the principle of induction.

Hannah Arendt: *The Human Condition***19. Explain and discuss the relation between the public and the private realm.**

The question asks for an explanation and discussion of the multifaceted relation between the public and the private. Its discussion is closely linked with Arendt's analysis of political life. Politics is the highest human activity, because it enables citizens to reflect on their collective life, give meaning to their personal lives and helps to develop a creative and cohesive community. Labour, work and action, each presuppose but go beyond, and hence are higher than, the preceding one. Action is a unique expression of the human capacities for freedom and transcendence. A key idea in Arendt's thought is that there is a certain zone in the life of any human being, the zone of "intimacy" or the private world, that should never appear in public. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Why Arendt wanted to maintain an awareness of the public/private distinction, even though she was also aware of how the two can easily become entangled in a particular life-story, *eg* Heidegger
- Whether the only way to avoid totalitarianism is to establish a well-ordered political community that encourages public participation and institutionalized political freedom
- Arendt's appeal for the creation of a public sphere through free, critical thinking and dialogue to provide a significant resource for contemporary thought
- The failure of Arendt's view on politics to take seriously enough the power of economic life in shaping the political life
- Whether Arendt's concern about politics is too dependent on particular historical situations (first half of the 20th century)
- Arendt's denunciation of the tendency of philosophy to withdraw from the public realm into solitary contemplation and abstraction. She intended a new and independent role for the intellectual in public culture
- Whether Arendt simply assumes that the public-private distinction is above questioning. This idea has been criticized by, for example, contemporary feminists.

20. Evaluate Arendt's view that the function of the faculty of promising is to master the basic unreliability of humans who can never guarantee today who they will be tomorrow, and that is the price human beings pay for freedom.

The question asks for an evaluation of the capacity to make promises in the context of Arendt's account of action. In turn, this issue might be related in different ways to her central concepts, *eg* labour, work and action. The unpredictability of the act of making promises results from: the basic unreliability of humans who can never guarantee today who they will be tomorrow, and the impossibility of foretelling consequences. Acting means acting within a community of equals where everybody has the same capacity to act. The force that keeps the people together, as distinguished from the space of appearances in which they gather and the power which keeps this public space in existence, is the force of mutual promise or contract. Promising unifies action and speech. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The extent to which social, political notions (*eg* social contract) can be accounted for by individual concepts such as promising
- Promising as a Christian legacy: faith in and hope for the world that found perhaps its most glorious and most succinct expression in the few words with which the gospels announced their glad tidings: "a child has been born unto us"
- Whether hope and promising are exclusively Christian-rooted actions, as Arendt seems to maintain
- Whether there are measures available to a society to enhance the likelihood of promises being kept (*eg* legal measures; social pressure, *etc*).

Simone de Beauvoir: *The Ethics of Ambiguity***21. Evaluate the claim that it is inconsistent of de Beauvoir to hold both that values are human creations and that there are absolute evils, such as lynching, rape and torture.**

The question asks for an evaluation of the consistency of de Beauvoir's belief that there are absolute evils with her belief that values are created by humans. Like other existentialists, de Beauvoir took the subject matter of ethics to be about the actions of individuals and their responsibility for those actions, rather than of what is right/wrong, good/bad, *etc.* She further believed that the ambiguities inherent in life ensure that the behaviour of individual agents is always imperfect. However, her account faces a serious problem because she also maintained that absolute evil can neither be justified nor excused, *ie*, that there is no ambiguity about the evil of atrocities. Her agent-centred approach to ethics thus seems to break down in the face of extreme harms (lynching, rape, torture, *etc.*). In response she fell back on what she deemed the "dynamics of history": in everyday life, as they struggle for survival, individuals have to interact with, and depend on, each other, even if they sometimes enhance their own interests at the expense of others; whereas in the course of historical struggles atrocities are perpetrated because individual agents become detached from their victims. Candidates might consider whether this move is capable of rendering her views consistent. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The defensibility of de Beauvoir's agent-centred existentialist account of ethics
- The role of "ambiguity" in de Beauvoir's account of ethics
- Whether de Beauvoir's account of the development of individuals from the state of childhood to responsibility amounts to an absolutist account of individual development
- The role of "the dynamics of history" in de Beauvoir's account of ethics
- Whether the appeal to the "dynamics of history" is capable of rendering her apparently conflicting ethical claims consistent.

22. Evaluate de Beauvoir’s claim that “to will oneself free is also to will others free”.

The question asks for an evaluation of de Beauvoir’s contention that an individual’s freedom is inextricably tied to freedom for all. Unlike some other existentialists, de Beauvoir emphasized the need for relationship with other agents. These other agents are both obstacles to an individual’s own freedom and facilitators of the agent’s liberation. For existentialists, including de Beauvoir, individuals must act for themselves, make their own decisions, and bear responsibility for their actions and decisions without the help of values that are independently given. An individual is thus alone in choosing and acting. But that does not mean those choices and actions cannot be either hindered or facilitated by what others do. Not only is it an act of bad faith not to acknowledge that others, too, have freedom, an individual’s own freedom (*eg* to pursue her projects) has significance only when recognized by others. Hence, others must also be free if they are to attribute significance to what an individual does, and conversely. Freedom requires reciprocity. Oppression consists of denying the freedom of others because it makes the oppressor’s own freedom paramount and hence is a denial of the ambiguity of the oppressor’s own situation. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The role that relationships with others play in de Beauvoir’s account of personal freedom
- Whether it is true that an individual’s personal freedom only has significance when acknowledged by others
- Whether oppression is only a matter of an individual giving paramountcy to her own freedom
- Whether an individual’s giving paramountcy to her own freedom is a denial of the ambiguity of her own situation.

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

23. Explain and discuss the importance of differentiating between manner and matter for authenticity to exist.

This question asks for an explanation and discussion of the nature of manner and matter and how their differences are essential in bringing about the ideal of authenticity, which allows us to articulate our own identity. Taylor’s definitions of both “manner” and “matter” need to be explored; the former concerned with self-fulfilling actions so as to bring about authenticity, and the latter being associated with content and not self-referential. Manner cannot be separated from the self: my goals and objectives must fulfil my desires. However manner can involve collective values which show how groupings of individuals can be understood; the role of the other in bringing about authenticity. The self-referential nature of manner seems inescapable in our culture because our culture is so individualistic and self-orientated. We are atomized and subjective selves. In contrast with manner, my goals and objectives might not fulfil my desires as they might be political goals or focused on religion. However, matter can be subjective and is not necessarily understood through community/collective symbols. An example that might be used is art which could be used to illustrate how, in recent times, people might no longer have common reference points as they had in the past because of subjectivity. Similarly, language might be used to illustrate how subtleties of meaning have to be discovered, and are no longer self-evident in the denotation of the words that are used. To be authentic in the malaise of modernity we have to find our own “sentiments of existence” by which we connect ourselves to a wider world. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether there is any real difference between manner and matter. Self-referencing acts can be both individualistic and collective, and might not in themselves be contradictory or mutually exclusive
- Whether art and language are good examples. The art of the past was not accessible to the masses, and it is only the present that sees the symbolism that was used in past paintings. With language has there not always been a play on words which is often lost to many people?
- Whether Taylor overstates the crisis of the isolated self in modern society. Is it not possible that people are content in their isolation?
- Whether instrumental reason and self-centred fulfilment really create confusion in our society.

24. Explain and discuss the extent to which there is an “eclipse of ends” through instrumental reason.

This question invites an explanation and discussion of the role instrumental reason might have in creating an understanding of people as means not just ends. Instrumental reason might be efficient, but it atomizes people and civil virtue decreases. Equally, instrumental reason might increase cultural narcissism, and this is a danger to the moral horizon and political liberty. Despotism, democratic bureaucracies might limit freedom; the less a citizen is involved, the more the government takes control. Increasing individual satisfaction in terms of material gain might reduce the individual's involvement in contributing to a larger society. Economic and technological changes have reduced the individual to a means to an end. The increasing stress on measuring and quantifying removes qualitative judgments and increasingly puts the individual into the role of a cog in a complex societal wheel in which their individual identity is lost. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether changes in technology, which create social networking sites and mass communication, establish a new notion of involvement in public life and expression of civil responsibility
 - Whether isolated individuals cease to be ends in themselves
 - Whether individuals should have civic responsibility
 - Whether the malaise of modernity is overstated
 - Whether authenticity requires social intercourse; am I dependent on others?
-